VOL. XXXVIII JULY 1954 NO. 3

THE JOURNAL OF AGRICULTURE

of the

UNIVERSITY OF PUERTO RICO

LACK OF RESIDUAL INFLUENCE FROM SUBSOIL FERTILIZATION OF A SUGARCANE PLANT CROP UPON THE SUCCEEDING RATOON CROP.....*M. B. Martínez and M. A. Lugo-López*

THE EFFECT OF ELEVATION ON THE SUCROSE CONTENT OF SUGARCANE.....*M. A. Lugo-López and B. G. Capó*

THE EFFECT OF SOIL CONDITIONS ON THE SUCROSE CONTENT OF SUGARCANE.....*M. A. Lugo-López*

RESEARCH NOTES

PHOSPHORUS CONTENT OF PINEAPPLE JUICE....*Rafael Santini, Jr.*

PUBLISHED BY
UNIVERSITY OF PUERTO RICO
AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION
RÍO PIEDRAS, P. R.

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO

Entered as second-class matter June 1, 1953, at the post office at Río Piedras, under the Act of August 24 1912, as amended by the Act of August 4, 1947.

30.5
836

AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION

University of Puerto Rico, JAIME BENÍTEZ, M.A., LL.M., *Chancellor*

Station Staff[1]

Arturo Roque, M.S. ..... *Director*
B. G. Capó, Ph.D. ..... *Assoc. Dir. for Research*

Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology
P. B. Vásques Calcerrada, Ph.D., Rural Sociol., Head of Dept.
S. E. Alemañy, M.A., Instr. and Res. Asst. in Agron.
H. Bayrón[2], B.S.A., Asst. Econ.
A. Burgos[2], M.S., Res. Asst. in Rural Sociol.
J. R. Calderón[3], B.S., Res. Asst. in Econ.
G. Espinet, B.S., Res. Asst. in Econ.
D. Haddock, M.B.A., Econ.
L. Hernández[2], B.A., Res. Asst. in Econ
A. Llorens, B.S., Res. Asst. in Econ.
J. E. Mora, B.S., Res. Asst. in Econ.
P. Negrón Ramos, B.S., Res. Asst. in Econ.
J. Olivieri[3], B.S., Res. Asst. in Econ.
M. Piñero, B.S., Assoc. Econ.
José M. Rios, M.S., Asst. Sociol.
F. Román, M.S., Asst. Econ.
E. Silva, M.S., Asst. Econ.
C. Stella, B.S., Res. Asst. in Econ.

Agronomy and Horticulture
B. G. Capó, Ph.D., Head of Dept.
L. Alemañy, B.S., Res. Asst. in Hort.
S. Alers Alers, B.S., Res. Asst. in Agron.
F. Aróstegui, M.S., Assoc. Agron.
I. Bangdiwala, M.S., Asst. Statistician
A. Cruz-Miret, B.S., Res. Asst. in Agron.
P. Landrau, Jr., M.S., Asst. Agron.
J. H. López Rosa, B.S., Res. Asst. in Agron.
F. Méndez, M.S., Agron.
W. Pennock, M.S., Hort.
J. P. Rodríguez, B.S., Assoc. Agron.

Animal Husbandry
L. Rivera Brenes, Ph.D., An. Husb., Head of Dept.
J. I. Cabrera, M.S., Assoc. An. Husb.
L. F. Colón, M.S., Res. Asst. in Chem.
F. J. Marchán, M.S., Assoc. Chem.
J. D. Rivera-Anaya, D.V.M., Vet.
C. Santos, B.S., Res. Asst. in An. Husb.
A. Torrech, M.S., Res. Asst. in Bact.

Central Analytical Laboratory
A. Riera, B.S., Assoc. Chem. in Charge
N. Flores, B.S., Anal. Chem. (Miss).
L. Igaravidez, B.S., Asst. Chem.
M. Medina de Mariani, M.S., Anal. Chem. (Mrs.)
G. Viscarra, B.S., Anal. Chem. (Miss)

Chemistry
F. Sánchez-Nieva, M.S., Chem., Head of Dept.
J. Escabí, B.S., Anal. Chem. (Miss)
I. G. Rieckehoff, M.S., Asst. Chem. (Mrs.)
A. Rios Torres, B.S., Asst. Res. in Chem.
A. J. Rodríguez, B.S., Asst. Chem.
R. Santini, Ph.D., Assoc. Chem.
E. Sotelo, B.S., Anal. Chem. (Miss)

Entomology
G. N. Wolcott[4], Ph.D., Ent., Head of Dept.
L. F. Martorell, Ph.D., Ent., Actg. Head of Dept.
J. L. Moreno, B.S., Res. Asst. in Ent.
M. E. Pérez, M.S., Asst. Ent.

Plant Breeding
P. González Rios, M.S., Plant Breeder, Head of Dept.
E. Boneta, M.S., Asst. Plant Breeder
A. Hernández, M.S., Res. Asst. in Cytology (Mrs.)
F. Mariota-Trias, M.S., Asst. Plant Breeder
C. Moscoso, M.S., Asst. Geneticist
J. Muratti, M.S., Asst. Geneticist
J. Vélez-Fortuño, M.S., Assoc. Plant Breeder

Plant Pathology
L. A. Alvarez, M.S., Plant Path., Head of Dept.
E. Asencio de Padilla, B.S., Lab. Technician (Mrs.)
J. Adsuar, B.S., Plant Path.
J. Bird, M.S., Asst. Plant Path.
L. López[2], B.S., Res. Asst. in Plant Path.
J. E. Pérez, Ph.D., Assoc. Bact.
G. W. Bruehl[5], Ph.D., Path. in Cane Breeding

Plant Physiology
——, Plant Physiol., Head of Dept.
H. Cibes, Ph.D., Assoc. Plant Physiol.
M. C. Fernández, Ph.G., Asst. Plant Physiol. (Mrs).
E. Hernández[3], M.S., Asst. Plant Physiol.
L. Miranda[4], B.S., Res. Asst. in Chem. (Miss)
G. Samuels, Ph.D., Plant Physiol.
M. A. Tió, Ph.D., Assoc. Plant Physiol

Soils
J. A. Bonnet, Ph.D., Soil Scient., Head of Dept.
M. A. Lugo-López, Ph.D., Assoc. Soil Scient.
R. Péres Escolar, B.S., Res. Asst. in Agron.
J. Roldán, B.S., Asst. Chem.

Cooperative ARS Research Project
J. Vicente Chandler[4], M.S., Sup. Coop. ARS Res. Project
F. Abruña[3], M.S., Soil Scient.
J. Figarella[4], B.S., Soil Scient.
R. Caro Costa[3], B.S., Res. Asst. in Soil Conserv.
S. Silva[4], Soil Sc. Aid

School of Tropical Medicine
D. Fernández, B.S., Asst. in Nutrn. (Miss)
A. Muñiz, B.S., Res. Asst. in Nutrn. (Miss)

College of Agriculture
R. U. Blasingame, B.S., Visiting Agr. Eng.

Library
J. P. Hayes, M.S., Librarian (Miss)

Office of the Editor
E. Molinary-Salés, B.S., Assoc. Ed.
T. Swann Harding, B.S., English Tech. Ed.

Service Department
M. Guevara, M.S., Adm. Asst.
A. Meléndez González, B.S., Assoc. Agron.
C. Rivera López, B.S., Asst. Agron. in Charge Sta. Farm

Rum Pilot Plant
V. Rodríguez-Benítez, M.S., Technical Director
H. M. Brau, M.S., Chem. Eng.
B. Calderón Tomei, B.S., Res. Asst. in Bact.
B. M. Camacho, B.S., Res. Asst. in Chem. (Miss)
A. García, Ph.D., Assoc. Chem.
Y. P. de Landrau, M.S., Asst. Chem. (Mrs.)
J. Rivera, M.S., Asst. Chem. (Miss)
J. Rosso, B.S., Res. Asst. in Chem. (Miss)
Z. Vidal de Seijo, Lab. Techn. (Mrs.)

Substations and Seed Farms:
Plant Propagation, Trujillo
W. Pennock, M.S., Hort. in Charge
Main Office—Seed Farms Division
M. Guevara, M.S., Assoc. Agron. in Charge
H. Meléndez González, B.S., Assoc. Agron.
Castañer Substation (Coffee)
A. Rodríguez Cabrera, M.S., Asst. Agron. in Charge
S. Rodríguez, B.S., Res. Asst. in Agron.
T. Sing Mallah, M.S., Asst. in Hort.
J. Toro, B.S., Res. Asst. in Hort.
Isabela Substation
A. Riollano, M.S., Agron. in Charge
M. Avilés, M.S., Assoc. Agron. in Charge Seed Farm
R. Abrams, B.S., Res. Asst. in Agron.
R. Gandía Caro, B.S., Res. Asst. in Agron.
L. B. Ortiz, M.S., Res. Asst. in Agron.
Lajas Substation
A. González Chapel, M.S., An. Husb. in Charge
I. Carlo, M.S., Res. Asst. in An. Husb.
E. N. Colón, B.S., Res. Asst. in An. Husb.
C. A. Ortiz Lugo, B.S., Asst. Agron.
J. Ortiz Vélez, B.S., Res. Asst. in An. Husb.
M. Rojas, M.S., Asst. An. Husb.
R. Vásquez, B.S., Res. Asst. in Agron.
Corozal Substation
H. Gandía-Díaz, B.S., Assoc. Hort. in Charge
G. del Toro[4], B.S., Res. Asst. in Agron.
R. Olivencia, M.S., Res. Asst. in Plant Breeding
Tobacco Substation
A. S. Amy, B.S., Assoc. Agron. in Charge
M. Manzano, B.S., Asst. Biochem.
G. Rigau, B.S., Asst. Agron.
R. Segall, Ph.D., Assoc. Plant Path.

---

[1] As of April 1954.
[2] Leave to pursue studies.
[3] Military leave.
[4] Other leaves.
[5] Collaborators, U.S.D.A.

THE JOURNAL OF AGRICULTURE
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PUERTO RICO

Issued quarterly by the Agricultural Experiment Station of the University of Puerto Rico, for the publication of articles by members of its personnel, or others, dealing with any of the more technical aspects of scientific agriculture in Puerto Rico or the Caribbean Area.

Vol. XXXVIII July 1954 No. 3

Lack of Residual Influence from Subsoil Fertilization of A Sugarcane Plant Crop upon the Succeeding Ratoon Crop[1]

M. B. Martínez and M. A. Lugo-López[2]

INTRODUCTION

In a previous paper (2)[3] the beneficial effect of subsoil fertilization on sugar yields of a sugarcane plant crop was reported. Yield increases of over 15 percent in a low productive soil were attributed to subsoil fertilization. In that work some of the plots received all the fertilizer on the topsoil, as is customary in sugarcane fields, while in others the fertilizer application was split equally between soil and subsoil (16–26 inches depth).

The results of this work helped to clarify the apparent discrepancies found in current literature concerning the practical aspects of deep tillage. Although the breaking of plowpans and loosening of tight subsoil layers have proven beneficial to crops in some of the older agricultural areas, no effects on crop yields have been reported from deep tillage in various other places. In the report cited (2) the increases in crop yields could not be attributed to deep tillage, as such, but rather to the more favorable fertility level of the subsoil following treatment.

It was then said (2): "Furthermore, in soils with subsoils in favorable physical condition, the addition of plant nutrients will also promote better root development. If the conditions that influence root extension are favorable both from the standpoint of tilth and nutrient availability, better crop

[1] This is the third in a series of articles by the same authors, the first two of which were published under the general title "Tillage Tests." The previous articles in the series were: I, Effect of subsoiling and mole drainage upon the minimum infiltration capacity of a heavy claypan soil of the Tropics, *J. Agr. Univ. P. R.* **36** (2) 179–85 1952; and II, The beneficial effect of subsoil fertilization on sugarcane yields, *J. Agr. Univ. P. R.* **37** (1) 35–43 (1953).

[2] Research Assistant in Agricultural Engineering and Associate Soil Scientist, respectively, Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Puerto Rico, Río Piedras, P. R.

Appreciation is expressed to O. L. Heyn and R. Mc.Connie of the Eastern Sugar Associates who provided all the materials and labor required to conduct the work herein reported.

[3] Numbers in parentheses refer to Literature Cited, p. 127.

yields are likely to be obtained." It was further stated that: "The residual effect of the original subsoil fertilization remains to be determined in succeeding ratoon crops. It might prove advantageous to fertilize the subsoil yearly."

This paper reports the data obtained on the first-ratoon crop of the previously mentioned experiment where a study was conducted to determine the residual effect, if any, of subsoil fertilization of the plant crop upon the succeeding ratoon crop, i. e., 28 months after the establishment of the treatment differentials.

EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURE

A summary of some of the relevant field information derived from this experiment is given in table 1. Additional details for each soil treatment are given in table 2. The treatment differentials were established some 28 months prior to the harvest of the ratoon crop herein reported. In treatments Nos. 3, 5, 7, and 9, a 13-3-12 fertilizer was applied to the subsoil at the rate of 1,000 pounds to the acre. In treatments Nos. 4, 5, 8, and 9, an application of limestone, at the rate of 1,000 pounds to the acre, was made at the subsoil breakpoint. Two applications of the same fertilizer were made later, to a total of 2,000 pounds to the acre. The first and second surface applications of fertilizer were at only half the rate for plots fertilized at the subsoil as for those that had not previously received this subsoil treatment. The ratoon cane was fertilized uniformly with sulfate of ammonia at the rate of 1,200 pounds to the acre about 2 months after harvesting the plant crop and aligning the trash in alternate banks. Other agronomic practices

TABLE 1.—*Summary of soil-fertilizer treatments and other field information from the tillage-experimental field in east-central Puerto Rico*

Item	Information	Item	Information
Design	Triple lattice	Mean differences in plant-crop yields favoring subsoil fertilization	14 cwt. of sugar
Replications	9	Date of treatment	Jan. 17–24, 1951
Plot size	200 x 20 feet	Date of planting	Feb. 7–21, 1951
Sugarcane variety	P.O.J. 2878	Date of plant-crop harvest	Apr. 21–26, 1952
Soil type	Caguas silt loam	Date of ratoon-crop harvest	June 12–15, 1953
Summary of fertilizer treatments:			
Nos. 1, 2, 4, 6, 8	2,000 lb. of a 13-3-12 fertilizer to topsoil		
Nos. 3, 5, 7, 9	1,000 lb. of a 13-3-12 fertilizer to subsoil + 1,000 to topsoil		

TABLE 2.—*First ratoon-crop sugar yields for each treatment at tillage-experimental field in east-central Puerto Rico, showing other treatments occurring in the same group according to statistical design used*

Treatment identification No.	Soil treatment[1]	Other treatments in the same group	Sugar yields
			Cwt. per acre
1	Check (usual land preparation)	2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9	82.9
2	Subsoiling	1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8	80.1
3	Subsoiling with fertilizer on subsoil	1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 9	75.1
4	Subsoiling with lime on subsoil	1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8	82.7
5	Subsoiling with fertilizer and lime on subsoil	1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 9	88.8
6	Subsoiling and mole drainage	2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9	82.6
7	Subsoiling and mole drainage with fertilizer on subsoil	1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 9	85.9
8	Subsoiling and mole drainage with lime on subsoil	2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9	81.3
9	Subsoiling and mole drainage with lime and fertilizer on subsoil	1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8	70.8

L. S. D. between means of treatments within the same group:	
At the 5-percent level	7.72
At the 1-percent level	10.32
L. S. D. between means of treatments not within the same group:	
At the 5-percent level	8.13
At the 1-percent level	10.86
L. S. D. between any treatments, irrespective of grouping system (approximate):	
At the 5-percent level	7.98
At the 1-percent level	10.66

[1] Given 28 months prior to the second sugarcane harvest reported here.

were performed as is customary in ratoon-cane cultivation in east-central Puerto Rico.

The plant crop was harvested 14 months after establishing the treatment differentials and the first ratoon crop 14 months after harvesting the plant crop. At the time of harvest the cane from each plot was weighed in the field and samples of 20 canes each were taken at random from each plot. They were milled by a hydraulic Squier mill at the Station and the juice samples analyzed.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The mean sugar yields of the first-ratoon crop for each treatment are given in table 2. Each treatment is described, and other treatments occur-

ring in the same group with each respective treatment are indicated. There were no significant differences between the mean yields of plots that received all the fertilizer on the topsoil and those on which the fertilizer application was split equally between topsoil and subsoil. In the plant crop, harvested 14 months earlier, significant differences were measured between the mean sugar yield of all plots receiving fertilizer in the subsoil and those receiving fertilizer only on the topsoil (2,3).

However, it is evident from the ratoon-yield data that the application to the subsoil of a 13-3-12 fertilizer at the rate of 1,000 pounds to the acre, even though it benefited the plant crop, did not have any significant residual effect upon the succeeding ratoon-crop yield. The possibility of using larger quantities of fertilizer for the original application should be considered for future studies in areas like the one where this experiment is established, and where soils have a moderate exchange capacity of around 10 or 12 m.e., with not more than 50-percent base saturation (1).

SUMMARY

Data are presented here on sugar yields obtained with a ratoon crop growing on a heavy-claypan soil subjected to different tillage treatments some 28 months prior to the harvesting date. In a previous harvest—that of the original plant crop 14 months following treatments—significantly greater differences were measured favoring the plots which received half of the fertilizer on the subsoil over those receiving all the fertilizer on the topsoil. However, the data herein reported for the following ratoon crop indicate no residual effect from the original subsoil fertilization which could be measured in terms of sugar yields.

RESUMEN

Se presentan aquí datos sobre la producción de azúcar de un primer retoño de caña en un suelo pesado con un "claypan", sometido a varios tratamientos 28 meses antes de la recolección de la caña. En una cosecha anterior—la de la plantilla original efectuada a los 14 meses después de dados los tratamientos al terreno—se midieron diferencias significativas en los rendimientos. Estas diferencias favorecían las parcelas donde la mitad del abono se aplicó en el subsuelo y la otra mitad en la superficie, al compararlas con las que recibieron todo el abono en la superficie del suelo. Sin embargo, los datos que se informan aquí indican que la aplicación original del abono al subsuelo no tuvo ningún efecto residual sobre los rendimientos de azúcar del primer retoño.

LITERATURE CITED

1. Lugo-López, M. A., Martínez, M. B., and Riera, A. R., Morphological and physico-chemical properties of various tropical soils from east-central Puerto Rico, *J. Agr. Univ. P. R.* **36** (2) 167–78 1952.
2. Martínez, M. B. and Lugo-López, M. A., Tillage tests. II, The beneficial effect of subsoil fertilization on sugarcane yields, *J. Agr. Univ. P. R.* **37** (1) 35–43 1953.
3. Martínez, M. B. and Lugo López, M. A., Influence of subsoil shattering and fertilization on sugarcane production and soil infiltration capacity, *Soil Sci.* **75** (4) 307–15 1953.

The Effect of Elevation on the Sucrose Content of Sugarcane

M. A. Lugo-López and B. G. Capó[1]

INTRODUCTION

In Puerto Rico sugarcane is grown under a wide range of climatic conditions, rainfall being the main variable, in a large number of soil types with many extreme soil conditions, and at various altitudes ranging from almost sea level to over 1,500 feet. A large number of varieties are grown and there are differences in fertilization and other cultural practices. The variability in sucrose yields is rather large with many extremely low levels. Studies are under way with the objective of determining the fundamental reasons underlying those variations. In previous and forthcoming papers (2,3,6)[2] the influences of weather and climate, varieties, and fertilizer upon sucrose yields at harvesttime have been and will be reported and discussed.

It has been observed by many agriculturists that sugarcane grown at higher elevations yields juices richer in sucrose than when grown at lower altitudes. However, very little information is to be found in the available literature. Quintus (4) reported: "Besides rainfall, elevation above sea level affects the formation of saccharose. On estates situated at a high elevation, less cane is always produced, which disadvantage is partly or wholly made up by a greater sugar percent". In 1919, a report from Hawaii (5) recognized that, although there were differences in the behavior of cane varieties grown at different elevations, most varieties produced maximum sucrose at elevations of around 1,500 feet. The influence of elevation upon the sugarcane plant is, in all probability, closely related to climatic influences, particularly temperature. Geerligs (1) reported: "On plantations situated considerably above sea level the low night temperatures stop the growth and promote ripening".

This paper presents data to show the effect of elevation upon the sucrose content of sugarcane grown in Puerto Rico.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Data covering the period 1939–49 were gathered from a large number of commercial fields of east-central Puerto Rico. Elevations were obtained for each field by superimposing topographic maps over field-distribution maps. They were subsequently spot-checked with a Short and Mason aneroid barometer. The data were classified and grouped by varieties and altitude

[1] Associate Soil Scientist and Associate Director for Research, respectively, Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Puerto Rico, Río Piedras, P. R.

[2] Numbers in parentheses refer to Literature Cited, p. 131.

intervals, disregarding climatic and edaphic differences. However, rainfall differences were not marked over most of the area studied and the differences in mean temperature were slight. Variations in soil types were numerous. Four sugarcane varieties were included in the study, namely, P.O.J. 2878, B.H. 10(12), P.R. 803, and F.C. 916. The study includes data from 695 crops harvested during the 10-year investigation period at the various altitude intervals in an attempt to explain at least some of the variability observed.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 summarizes the study of the relation between sucrose content at harvesttime and field elevation. The over-all picture indicates that sugarcane grown at lower elevations tends to contain less sucrose than that grown at higher elevations. In general, the main differences occur in canes grown 1 to 10 m. above mean sea level and canes grown at the highest elevations studied. The differences among the other class intervals are negligible. A differential response among varieties can also be observed in table 1. Some varieties like P.O.J. 2878 and P.R. 803 yielded juices of very low sucrose content when grown at elevations ranging from 1 to 10 m. above mean sea

TABLE 1.—*Mean yields of available 96° sugar-percent-cane of 4 sugarcane varieties when grown at various elevations*

Variety and number of crops	Elevation (m.)	Available 96° sugar yields
		Percent-cane
Variety P.O.J. 2878:		
35	1–10	9.48
170	10–100	11.52
97	100–200	11.61
49	200–400	11.72
Variety B.H. 10(12):		
170	1–10	11.30
47	10–100	12.13
24	100–200	12.01
Variety P.R. 803:		
6	1–10	9.42
15	10–100	11.57
23	100–200	12.04
Variety F.C. 916:		
7	1–10	10.63
6	10–100	11.56
All varieties:		
242	1–10	10.94
259	10–100	11.62
144	100–200	11.79
50	200–400	11.78

TABLE 2.—*Monthly fluctuations in maximum, minimum, and mean temperature (°F.) at 2 selected stations located at different elevations*

Months	Temperature at indicated locations					
	Humacao (low elevation)			Cayey (high elevation)		
	Maximum	Minimum	Mean	Maximum	Minimum	Mean
January	83.2	59.8	72.3	85.0	51.0	68.4
February	84.7	58.3	72.4	85.2	50.0	68.2
March	87.0	59.0	74.3	86.8	50.7	70.6
April	87.8	61.3	76.1	88.2	53.4	72.0
May	88.5	66.3	78.7	90.5	56.5	74.2
June	88.8	69.7	79.9	88.8	61.8	75.6
July	89.7	69.5	79.8	89.4	62.5	75.5
August	91.5	70.2	80.2	90.4	60.6	75.3
September	90.6	69.2	78.9	88.8	60.3	75.2
October	90.0	68.2	78.4	88.8	60.0	75.0
November	87.2	64.2	75.9	88.2	59.7	73.4
December	84.0	60.8	73.6	87.0	54.8	70.9

level. Others produced juices of better quality. The differences in sucrose yields among the leading varieties commercially grown in Puerto Rico have already been discussed (3).

Table 2 gives the monthly temperatures at two selected stations representative of low and high sugarcane-producing areas: Humacao, on the east coast, and Cayey in the east-central mountains. In general, there is a difference in mean temperatures of about 4°F. between the two stations. Differences in maximum temperatures are negligible, but differences in minimum temperatures are of the order of 8°F. on the monthly basis. Thus the sugarcane planted at high altitudes enjoys about the same benefits from sunlight, as measured by "total day-degrees"[3], with the added advantage of much cooler nights than the sugarcane planted on low sites. Hence, the beneficial effect of relatively high altitudes upon sucrose yields may reflect the influence of cool nights. There is also the possibility of some parallelism between the effects of elevation and soil conditions.

SUMMARY

Data are presented to show the influence of elevation on sucrose yields of four varieties of sugarcane: P.O.J. 2878, B.H. 10(12), P.R. 803, and F.C. 916. An over-all examination of the data from 695 crops harvested during a 10-year period, 1939–49, disclosed that elevations higher than 10 m. above mean sea level favor high sucrose accumulation in sugarcane. This effect

[3] Degrees above 70°F. for a given period.

was more pronounced with some varieties than with others. This influence of altitude is probably a reflection of climatic effects. Data are presented to show that cane growing at high elevations within a given area, enjoys about the same benefits from sunlight, as measured by "total day-degrees", with the added advantage of cooler nights.

RESUMEN

En este trabajo se presentan datos que demuestran cómo influye la altitud a que se siembra la caña de azúcar sobre sus rendimientos de sacarosa. Cuando se hace un estudio de estos datos se percibe el hecho de que la caña que se siembra a más de 10 m. sobre el nivel del mar produce jugos más ricos en sacarosa que la de sitios más bajos. Este efecto de la altura sobre el mayor o menor contenido de sacarosa en la caña es con toda probabilidad una acción refleja de los efectos del clima.

Específicamente se aportan datos que señalan que la caña de azúcar en sitios altos, además de recibir los efectos beneficiosos de la radiación solar de igual manera que la que crece a menor altitud, también recibe los efectos de una temperatura más baja durante la noche.

LITERATURE CITED

1. Geerligs, H. C., Cane sugar and its manufacture, 1924; cited by Das, U. K.; *Hawaiian Planters' Rec.* **35** 163–201 1931.
2. Lugo-López, M. A. and Capó, B. G., The effect of weather and climate on the sucrose content of sugarcane, *J. Agr. Univ. P. R.* **38** (4) 1954.
3. Lugo-López, M. A., Samuels, G., and Méndez, F., Factors affecting the sucrose content of sugarcane: III, Varieties, *J. Agr. Univ. P. R.* **37** (1) 28–34 1953.
4. Quintus, R. A., The cultivation of sugarcane in Java, 1923; cited by Das, U. K.; *Hawaiian Planters' Rec.* **35** 163–201, 1931.
5. Report of the committee in charge of the Experiment Station of the Hawaiian Sugar Producers' Association, p. 29, 1919.
6. Samuels, G., Lugo-López, M. A., and Landrau Jr., P., Factors affecting the sucrose content of sugarcane: Fertilizers, *J. Agr. Univ. P. R.* **36** (3) 194–202, 1952.

The Effect of Soil Conditions on the Sucrose Content of Sugarcane

M. A. Lugo-López[1]

INTRODUCTION

Fundamentally a crop is the combined product of the biological and environmental factors at play during the cropping season. In other papers it was and will be indicated that the ecological factors of weather and elevation exert an important influence upon the sugarcane plant and its final sucrose content at harvesttime (3, 4)[2]. The sucrose-yielding potential of some 20 leading varieties under various climatic and edaphic conditions has also been studied (8). Of the cultural factors, the influence of fertilizers on sucrose yields has been emphasized especially (10).

Recent work by González Ríos and Adsuar (1) has shown the detrimental influence of mosaic disease on the sucrose yields of some varieties. Landrau and Adsuar (2) reported that chlorotic-streak-infected canes produced less cane-tonnage than healthy canes, but their sucrose content remained unaffected. Martorell and Bangdiwala (9) showed that borer infestation can significantly reduce the sucrose content of cane. Attempts have been made to affect the sucrose content of sugarcane through preharvest foliage sprays with plant growth regulators (5, 7).

The influence of many other factors remains to be investigated under Puerto Rican conditions. The effect of time of planting and harvesting, arrowing, liming, irrigation, and a number of other factors offers a promising field for research. The adequate regulation of the controllable factors affecting the sucrose content of sugarcane still remains a challenge in most sugarcane-growing areas.

This paper presents information on the influence of soil conditions on the sucrose content of sugarcane.

METHODS OF STUDY

Data were collected from a rather large number of sugarcane fields comprising five broad geographic areas: East-central, northwest-interior, northeastern, northern, and southern. Four distinct farm areas were studied in the northern region, namely, Toa, Cambalache, Plazuela, and Loíza. Yield records were taken for a number of years (11 years in the east-central, 21 in the southern, 10 in the northwest-interior, 2 in the northeastern, and 1 in the northern region) and information was compiled as to varieties,

[1] Associate Soil Scientist, Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Puerto Rico, Río Piedras, P. R.

[2] Numbers in parentheses refer to Literature Cited, pp. 145-46.

age of harvest, rainfall, elevation, soil type, and other factors. The soil types were determined by superimposing field-distribution maps over detailed soil-survey maps. Spot-checking of soil types was made by examining some profiles in the field either by observations on road cuts or in pits dug especially for the purpose, and more extensively by examining the soil profiles with an auger at selected sites.

The data were then classified by soil types and crop years; in addition, the data from the northern region were further subdivided by varieties. Analyses-of-variance studies were made of the data from each area.

Some of the available information was classified according to certain properties of the soils which were regarded as indices of their physical, chemical, and mineralogical nature. To study the interaction between soils and varieties data were taken at random for a limited number of soils for which production records were available for at least two varieties. The interaction between climate and soil was determined from yield data obtained in a given soil type occurring extensively in more than one of the areas studied.

DESCRIPTION OF SOIL AREAS STUDIED

The annual rainfall in the northern, east-central, northeastern, and northwest-interior regions ranges from 60 to 75 inches along the immediate coast to over 75 inches near the foothills, the heaviest falls of 90 inches or more occurring to the east and southeast of the Luquillo mountains. The southern region receives the least rainfall on the Island, an average of 30 to 40 inches annually. The annual temperature (below 1,000 feet elevation) averages 76° to 80°F. At elevations between 1,000 and 2,000 feet the annual temperature averages 71° to 75°F.

The soils of the east-central and northeastern regions are mostly derived from quartz-diorite and granite, but in some cases the parent material consists of tuffaceous shales and andesites. There are also some areas of organic soils. In general, the soils of this area are rather acid and of moderate fertility. In the lowlands of the east-central region soils are generally imperfectly and often poorly drained, and occasionally claypans are found underlying the plow layer (6).

In the northwest-interior, soils are derived from two broad groups of parent materials: Limestone towards the extreme northern interior and tuffaceous rocks toward the western interior. They are generally well-drained except for areas of the Chernozemlike soils where drainage is somewhat restricted. Fertility ranges from moderately low to high.

In the southern region the soils are neutral or alkaline, rather deep, and very fertile. They are derived from a variety of materials. As a rule, irrigation is necessary to raise crops profitably.

TABLE 1.—*Mean sucrose yields of sugarcane grown in different soil types within the east-central region of Puerto Rico, including differences between means*[1]

Soil type	Soil identification No.	Mean sucrose yields	Differences between means of soil types Nos.—								
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
		Percent									
Yabucoa silty clay loam	1	12.1120									
Las Piedras silty clay loam	2	11.9497	0.1623								
Río Arriba clay	3	11.8400	.2720	0.1097							
Mabí clay	4	11.8300	.2820	.1197	0.0100						
Josefa clay loam	5	11.8170	.2950	.1327	.0230	0.0130					
Candelero loam	6	11.8135	.2985	.1362	.0265	.0165	0.0035				
Juncos silt loam	7	11.7937	.3183	.1560	.0463	.0363	.0233	0.0198			
Cayaguá silt loam	8	11.6698	.4422	.2799	.1702	.1602	.1472	.1437	0.1239		
Irurena clay	9	11.6420	.4700	.3077	.1980	.1880	.1750	.1715	.1517	0.0278	
Sabana clay	10	11.6378	.4742	.3119	.2022	.1922	.1792	.1757	.1559	.0320	0.0042
Vía silty clay	11	11.5071	.6049	.4426*	.3329	.3229	.3099	.3064	.2866	.1627	.1349
Múcara silty clay loam	12	11.4236	.6884	.5261	.4164	.4064	.3934	.3899	.3701	.2462	.2184
Toa loam	13	11.3653	.7467	.5844**	.4747	.4647**	.4517	.4482	.4284*	.3045	.2767
Coloso clay loam	14	11.2873	.8247	.6624**	.5527	.5427**	.5297	.5262	.5064**	.3825	.3547
Torres clay	15	11.0506	1.0614*	.8991**	.7894	.7794**	.7664	.7620*	.7431**	.6192*	.5914
Palmas Altas loam	16	10.7967	1.3153*	1.1530**	1.0433**	1.0333**	1.0203**	1.0168**	.9970**	.8731**	.8453**
Reparada clay	17	10.4585	1.6535**	1.4912**	1.3815**	1.3715**	1.3585**	1.3550**	1.3352**	1.2113**	1.1835**
Caguas clay	18	10.4400	1.6720*	1.5097**	1.4000*	1.3900*	1.3770*	1.3735*	1.3537*	1.2298*	1.2020*
Aguadilla loamy sand	19	9.3654	2.7466**	2.5843**	2.4746**	2.4646**	2.4516**	2.4481**	2.4283**	2.3044**	2.2766**

Soil type	Soil identification No.	Mean sucrose yields	Differences between means of soil types Nos.—								
			10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
		Percent									
Yabucoa silty clay loam	1	12.1120									
Las Piedras silty clay loam	2	11.9497									
Río Arriba clay	3	11.8400									
Mabí clay	4	11.8300									
Josefa clay loam	5	11.8170									
Candelero loam	6	11.8135									
Juncos silt loam	7	11.7937									
Cayaguá silt loam	8	11.6698									
Irurena clay	9	11.6420									
Sabana clay	10	11.6378									
Vía silty clay	11	11.5071	0.1307								
Múcara silty clay loam	12	11.4236	.2142	0.0835							
Toa loam	13	11.3653	.2725	.1418	0.0583						
Coloso clay loam	14	11.2873	.3505	.2198	.1363	0.0780					
Torres clay	15	11.0506	.5872	.4565	.3730	.3147	0.2367				
Palmas Altas loam	16	10.7967	.8411*	.7104**	.6269	.5686**	.4906**	0.2539			
Reparada clay	17	10.4585	1.1793**	.0486**	.9651**	.9068**	.8288**	.5921*	0.3382		
Caguas clay	18	10.4400	1.1978*	1.0671	.9836	.9253	.8473	.6106	.3567	0.0185	
Aguadilla loamy sand	19	9.3654	2.2724**	2.1417**	2.0582**	1.9999**	1.9219**	1.6852**	1.4313**	1.0931**	1.0746

[1] * Significant; ** highly significant.

In the northern region the soils range from well-drained to poorly drained and from moderate to high in fertility. They are acid, and derived from limestone, tuffaceous rocks, and a variety of other materials.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

SUCROSE-YIELDING POTENTIAL OF VARIOUS SOILS

Tables 1, 2, and 3, give the mean yields, including differences between means of available 96° sugar-percent-cane of sugarcane grown in various soil types for a number of years in three broad geographic areas. Wide differences are apparent in the sucrose content of cane from different soils.

Table 1 reveals that the lowest sucrose yields are obtained in such lowlands soils as those of the Reparada, Palmas Altas, Caguas, and Aguadilla series, where the water table is generally at a high level throughout the year. In the alluvial soils of the Coloso and Toa series, considered the best sugarcane soils of the humid section of the Island, yields of approximately 11.3 percent are common. In other soils of rather hilly and undulating relief, such as the Las Piedras and Juncos soils, not rated as good cane soils as the level alluvial lands, yields of 11.95 and 11.80, respectively, have been consistently obtained over a period of years.

In southern Puerto Rico (table 2) the San Antón, Paso Seco, and Descalabrado soils yield canes of significantly lower sucrose concentrations than the rest of the soils comprised in the study. However, the sucrose yields obtained in this region were higher in every single soil than in the highest sucrose-yielding soils of the east-central region. This fact can be explained on basis of the climatic differences pointed out in a previous paper (3). Weather and climate are the predominant factors in determining cane and sucrose yields in an area, but within a given area of more or less uniform climatic conditions the differences in soil properties may bring about significant differences in sucrose concentrations.

Table 3 shows the mean sucrose yields obtained over a number of years on 12 different soil types and soil complexes in the northwest-interior region surrounding Central Plata. This is another area where sucrose yields are generally high, presumably because reduced rainfall and low night temperatures, both conducive to high sucrose accumulations, are predominant during the period just prior to the harvest (3). However, there were significant differences in the sucrose-yielding potential of the various soils. Except in the Toa, Soller, and the Soller-Santa Clara-Camagüey complex, sucrose yields were over 12.5 percent and compared very favorably with yields from southern Puerto Rico.

The analyses of the total sum of squared deviations of the sucrose data obtained from the three sugarcane-producing regions already discussed are presented in table 4. The results further indicate the dominant influence of

TABLE 2.—*Mean sucrose yields of sugarcane grown in different soil types within the southern region of Puerto Rico, including differences between means*[1]

Soil type	Soil identification No.	Mean sucrose yields	Differences between means of soil types Nos.—							
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
		Percent								
Santa Isabel silty clay	1	13.1626								
Aguirre clay	2	13.1190	0.0436							
Coamo clay	3	13.0018	.1608	0.1172						
Vives clay loam	4	12.9134	.2492*	.2056**	0.0884					
Paso Seco silty clay loam	5	12.8969	.2657*	.2221*	.1049	0.0165				
Machete clay	6	12.8965	.2661*	.2225*	.1053	.0169	0.0004			
Descalabrado silty clay	7	12.6648	.4978**	.4542**	.3370**	.2486*	.2321*	0.2317*		
Paso Seco silty clay	8	12.5762	.5864**	.5428**	.4256**	.3372**	.3207**	.3203**	0.0886	
San Antón silt loam	9	12.4875	.6751**	.6315**	.5143**	.4259**	.4094**	.4090**	.1773	0.0887

[1] * Significant; ** highly significant.

TABLE 3.—*Mean sucrose yields of sugarcane grown in different soils within the northwest-interior region of Puerto Rico, including differences between means*[1]

Soil types or complex	Soil identification No.	Mean sucrose yields	Differences between means of soil types Nos.—										
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
		Percent											
Cialitos clay	1	13.2169											
Lares clay	2	13.1991	0.0178										
Tanamá clay	3	13.1107	.1062	0.0884									
Camagüey—Moca	4	13.0860	.1309	.1131	0.0247								
Catalina clay	5	13.0263	.1906	.1728	.0844	0.0597							
Santa Clara clay	6	12.9756	.2413*	.2235	.1351	.1104	0.0507						
Colinas clay	7	12.8682	.3487**	.3309**	.2425	.2178	.1581	0.1074					
Moca clay	8	12.7379	.4790**	.4612**	.3728	.3481**	.2884**	.2377*	0.1303				
Camagüey clay	9	12.5093	.7076**	.6898**	.6014*	.5767**	.5170**	.4663**	.3589**	0.2286*			
Toa clay	10	12.3086	.9083**	.8905**	.8021**	.7774**	.7177**	.6670**	.5596**	.4293**	0.2007		
Soller—Santa Clara—Camagüey	11	12.1543	1.0626**	1.0448**	.9564**	.9317**	.8720**	.8213**	.7139**	.5836**	.3550**	0.1543	
Soller clay	12	12.1063	1.1106**	1.0928**	1.0044**	.9797**	.9200**	.8693**	.7619**	.6316	.4030**	.2023*	0.0480

[1] * Significant; ** highly significant.

TABLE 4.—*Analysis of the total sum of squared deviations for the sucrose yield data obtained from 3 broad sugarcane-producing regions in Puerto Rico*

Source	Degrees of freedom	Sum of squares	Mean square	*F* value[1]
		East-central region		
Total	743	1,171.69		
Soils	18	191.72	10.65	8.91**
Years	10	125.45	12.54	10.50**
Error	715	854.52	1.09	
		Southern region		
Total	1,777	2,556.63		
Soils	8	75.04	9.38	8.07**
Years	20	447.58	22.38	19.24**
Error	1,749	2,034.01	1.16	
		Northwest-interior region		
Total	2,210	2,999.75		
Soils	11	302.64	27.51	34.96**
Years	9	973.63	108.18	137.46**
Error	2,190	1,723.47	.78	

[1] ** Highly significant.

weather, as exemplified by the high significance of the variations due to years. Moreover, the differences in the sucrose-yielding potential of the soils within each region are also highly significant.

Table 5 gives mean sucrose yields for two crop years and three varieties in various soils of the northeastern region. The study of the data corresponding to the 1951 crop and variety P.O.J. 2878, revealed significant differences in the sucrose-yielding potential of various soils. No significant differences were measured either in the three soils where yield records of P.R. 902 were available, or in those of B.H. 10(12) for the 1952 crop.

Data on the sucrose yields of sugarcane in four broad farm areas in northern Puerto Rico are given in table 6. In Cambalache for 1951, significant differences in the sucrose-yielding potential of soils were measured in fields growing both M. 275 and P.O.J. 2878. Some areas of the Toa and Coloso soils, considered among the top-ranking sugarcane soils of the area, produced cane with low sucrose contents, dropping to extremes of about 8.5 percent. Other types within the Toa soil series produced better yields, indicative of the large variability among and within soils. In the Loíza area the Toa soils produced yields inferior to those of the Colosos, at least for

TABLE 5.—*Mean sucrose yields of sugarcane grown in various soils of the northeastern region of Puerto Rico for the crop years 1951 and 1952*

Soil type	Variety	Mean sucrose yields
1951 crop year		
		Percent
Fortuna clay loam, stony phase	P.O.J. 2878	11.50
Catalina clay	do.	10.93
Estación silt loam	do.	10.33
Múcara silty clay	do.	10.08
Múcara silty clay loam	do.	9.98
Juncos silty clay loam	do.	9.95
Cialitos clay	do.	9.93
Palmas Altas clay, poorly drained phase	do.	9.91
Mabí clay	do.	9.84
Sábana silty clay loam	do.	9.68
Juncos clay	do.	9.63
Sabana silty clay	do.	9.05
Cataño loamy sand	P.R. 902	12.91
Fajardo clay	do.	11.89
Estación loam	do.	10.26
1952 crop year		
Cataño loamy sand	B.H. 10(12)	11.62
Coloso silty clay loam	do.	11.51
Vega Baja silty clay	do.	10.83
Estación silt loam	do.	10.69
Cialitos clay	do.	10.48
Fajardo clay	do.	10.21
Fortuna clay loam	do.	10.12
Estación loam	do.	9.86
Fortuna clay	do.	9.62
Múcara silty clay loam	do.	9.45
Mabí clay	do.	9.15

the 1952 crop. Consideration must be given to the fact that the Toa fine sandy loam included in this study occurs in low positions and is usually subject to frequent overflows. Unless deep drainage ditches are dug at intervals to maintain the water table low, the excess moisture is likely to promote a rank growth of foliage, and the cane juices are lower in sucrose content.

No significant differences were measured in yields of variety P.O.J. 2878 in the Plazuela area. However, both M. 336 and M. 275 yielded juices of significantly lower sucrose contents in the Toa than in the Coloso soils. In the Toa area, no significant differences were measured for the 1951 crop in the Toa, Coloso, and Sabana Seca soils from which M. 275 was harvested.

TABLE 6.—*Mean sucrose yields of sugarcane grown in 4 broad farm areas of the north coast of Puerto Rico for the years 1951 and 1952*

Farm area	Year	Soil type	Variety	Mean sucrose yields
				Percent
Cambalache	1951	Coloso silty clay loam	M. 336	12.05
		Toa silt loam	M. 275	11.81
		Toa silty clay loam	do.	10.81
		Toa fine sandy loam	do.	10.58
		Piñones clay loam, poorly drained phase	do.	10.28
		Coloso silt loam	do.	10.24
		Coloso silty clay loam	do.	9.40
		Coloso clay loam	do.	9.13
		Toa loam	do.	8.60
		Coloso loam	do.	8.49
		Tanamá clay, stony phase	P.O.J. 2878	11.80
		Sábana Seca silty clay loam	do.	10.18
		Toa silty clay loam	do.	9.35
		Coloso loam	do.	8.61
		Sábana Seca clay	do.	8.43
Loíza	1952	Toa clay loam	do.	11.22
		Coloso silty clay loam	do.	10.85
		do.	M. 336	11.96
		Coloso clay	do.	11.53
		Toa fine sandy loam	do.	11.02
		Sábana Seca clay	do.	10.81
		Coloso silty clay	do.	10.16
		Coloso silty clay loam	P.O.J. 2878	10.60
		Coloso silty clay	do.	10.54
		Coloso clay	do.	10.53
		Toa fine sandy loam	do.	9.54
Plazuela		Coloso silty clay loam	M. 275	10.60
		Coloso clay, poorly drained phase	do.	10.59
		Toa loam	do.	9.52
		Coloso silty clay	M. 336	11.09
		Toa loam	do.	9.71
		Piñones silty clay	P.O.J. 2878	10.48
		Coto sandy clay	do.	10.26
		Vega Alta sandy clay	do.	10.25
		Bayamón sandy loam	do.	10.21
		Coloso clay, poorly drained phase	do.	10.03
		Bayamón sandy clay	do.	9.29
		Coloso silty clay loam	do.	9.18

TABLE 6—*Continued*

Farm area	Year	Soil type	Variety	Mean sucrose yields
				Percent
Toa	1951	Sábana Seca clay	M. 275	11.93
		Toa clay	do.	11.81
		Coloso silty clay	do.	11.54
		Coloso clay	do.	11.40
		Coloso silty clay loam	do.	11.27
		Toa silt loam	do.	11.14
		Coloso clay	do.	11.13
		Coloso silt loam	do.	11.00
		Moca clay loam	P.O.J. 2878	12.41
		Toa silt loam	do.	12.02
		Vega Alta clay	do.	11.68
		Colinas clay loam	do.	11.64
		Moca clay	do.	11.39
		Coloso clay	do.	11.27
		Colinas clay loam, stony phase	do.	10.57

In the same crop year and area cane grown on the Moca soils outyielded all others with a mean sucrose percentage of 12.41, the highest measured for the whole northern area, all four farm areas included. The Moca soils of the northwest-interior (table 3) also had a good sucrose-producing potential, although they were not the best in that area.

SPECIFIC SOIL PROPERTIES AND THEIR EFFECT ON SUCROSE YIELDS

The variation in the sucrose-yielding potential of the different soils within a given geographic region has been emphasized. This variation must be attributable to the variation in intensity of some factor closely associated with the soil. An attempt was made to relate the sucrose-yielding potential to some soil properties and allied factors on which specific information was available for the areas considered in this study. Soil drainage was taken as an index of the physical condition of the soils. Soil reaction was regarded as an index of the chemical properties. Advantage was taken also of available information relative to parent material and physiographic position. Table 7 summarizes the results of this approach to the problem.

In general, lower sucrose yields were obtained from sugarcane growing in poorly drained soils rather than in their better drained equivalents within the same geographic district. Furthermore, better sucrose yields were obtained in soils which were neutral to alkaline in reaction than in acid soils. Table 7 further shows that better sucrose yields were obtained in areas of

TABLE 7.—*The influence of soil drainage, reaction, and other factors on the sucrose content of sugarcane*

Soil characteristic	Number of crops	Mean sucrose yields
Drainage		
		Percent
Well-drained	543	11.8
Poorly drained	245	10.1
Reaction		
Neutral to alkaline	1,778	12.9
Acid	744	11.5
Parent material		
Limestone	2,191	12.7
Granitic and tuffaceous materials	788	11.4
Physiografic position		
Hills	97	11.9
Alluvial plains	147	11.3

soils derived from limestone than in adjoining soil areas where tuffaceous and granitic materials constituted the parent material of the soils. Richer canes were usually harvested from hilly soils than from nearby alluvial-plain soils.

Specific information was not available at the time this survey was conducted to permit the study of the relationship of soil sucrose-yielding potential to other important soil properties. However, the information presented clearly points to the influence of some factor closely connected with the soil and which has a great bearing on the sucrose-yielding potential.

INTERACTION OF SOILS AND VARIETIES

From the data available for this study it was evident that, in general, some soils have a higher sucrose-yielding potential than others. This potential difference, of course, can be explained on a basis of soil-associated factors. However, it was also observed that some varieties performed better than others in a given soil or group of soils. Table 8 presents data taken at random for a limited number of soil types showing this variation within soils attributable to varieties. Variety B.H. 10(12) yielded canes of higher sucrose content in all the soils selected than did P.O.J. 2878. This is in agree-

TABLE 8.—*Comparison of the sucrose yields of 2 sugarcane varieties in 4 different soils of Puerto Rico*

Soil	Sucrose yields of variety—	
	B.H. 10(12)	P.O.J. 2878
	Percent	*Percent*
Candelero	12.65	10.13
Toa	11.88	11.01
Palmas Altas	11.02	9.46
Reparada	10.78	9.34

ment with data previously presented comparing the behavior of 20 selected varieties within three broad climatic areas (8). Variety P.O.J. 2878, however, yielded more sucrose in the Toa than in the Candelero soils, whereas variety B.H. 10(12) yielded more in the Candelero than in the Toa.

INTERACTION OF SOILS AND CLIMATE

Data were obtained relative to the sucrose-yielding potential of some soils occurring in more than one area of those included in this study. The following tabulation shows the sucrose yields of P.O.J. 2878 harvested from fields of Toa clay loam occurring in three of the areas considered.

Climatic area	*Mean sucrose yields*
	Percent
Northwest-interior	12.31
East-central	11.36
Northern	11.22

The highest sucrose yields were obtained in the northwest-interior area. All three areas are characterized by rather heavy rainfall, but there is a more definite dry season corresponding to the harvesting period in the northwest-interior region. Moreover, night temperatures are lower throughout the year. Both of these factors are conducive to higher sucrose production and accumulation. Therefore, within a given area the sucrose-yielding potential of a given soil is limited by the other ecological forces at play.

SUMMARY

Data are presented herein to show the influence of soils and soil conditions on the sucrose yield of sugarcane. Information derived from five broad geographic areas of Puerto Rico, namely: North, south, northeast, east-central, and northwest-interior, was analyzed critically. There were significant differences in the sucrose-yielding potential of several commercial sugarcane varieties among some soils within each area. These differences

are attributable to variations in the properties of the various soil types or complexes, or to some factor closely connected with the soil like drainage, chemical reaction, and so on.

Some varieties produced higher sucrose yields than others even when growing under similar edaphic conditions. Different varieties of sugarcane produced their maximum yields in different soils, thus indicating a certain degree of variability and adaptation to the soil, as far as this factor was concerned. Within a given area the sucrose-yielding potential of a given soil may be modified considerably by the dominant climatic conditions.

RESUMEN

En este trabajo se presentan datos que demuestran cómo influyen el suelo y sus propiedades sobre los rendimientos de sacarosa de la caña de azúcar. Al hacer los análisis estadísticos de los datos obtenidos en las zonas norte, sur, noreste, este-central y noroeste del interior, se encontraron diferencias significativas en cuanto a la producción de sacarosa en los distintos suelos, dentro de una zona específica. Estas diferencias pueden atribuirse a variaciones en las propiedades de los suelos o a las de algún factor estrechamente relacionado con los suelos.

Se observó que algunas variedades tienen mayor contenido de sacarosa que otras, aún desarrollándose en condiciones edáficas más o menos iguales. Variedades distintas pueden producir su máximo rendimiento de sacarosa en distintos suelos, lo cual indica una variabilidad de adaptación en este respecto. Dentro de una zona en particular el efecto de los suelos sobre la producción de sacarosa de la caña de azúcar está sujeto a modificaciones por los factores climáticos predominantes.

LITERATURE CITED

1. González-Ríos, P., and Adsuar, J., Effect of mosaic on the yield of sugarcane variety B. 34-104, *J. Agr. Univ. P. R.* **37** (1) 13-8 1953.
2. Landrau, Jr., P., and Adsuar, J., Effect of chlorotic streak on the yield of sugarcane, *J. Agr. Univ. P. R.* **37** (1) 19-27 1953.
3. Lugo-López, M. A. and Capó, B. G., The effect of weather and climate on the sucrose content of sugarcane, *J. Agr. Univ. P. R.* **38** (4) 1954.
4. ——— The effect of elevation on the sucrose content of sugarcane, *J. Agr. Univ. P. R.* **38** (3) 128-31 1954.
5. Lugo-López, M. A. and Grant, R., Preharvest foliage sprays of sugarcane with 2,4-D, *J. Agr. Univ. P. R.* **36** (3) 187-93 1952.
6. Lugo-López, M. A., Martínez, M. B., and Riera, A. R., Morphological and physicochemical properties of various tropical soils from east-central Puerto Rico, *J. Agr. Univ. P. R.* **36** (2) 167-78 1952.
7. Lugo-López, M. A., Samuels, G., and Grant, R., Failure of preharvest foliage sprays with 2,4-D and maleic hydrazide to affect the sucrose content of cane, *J. Agr. Univ. P. R.* **37** (1) 44-51 1953.

8. Lugo-López, M. A., Samuels, G., and Méndez, F., Factors affecting the sucrose content of sugarcane: III, Varieties, *J. Agr. Univ. P. R.* **37** (1) 28–34 1953.
9. Martorell, L. F. and Bangdiwala, I. S., Sucrose content of sugarcane as affected by moth-borer (*Diatraea saccharalis* Fabricious) infestation, Presented at Entomological Section of the Eighth Congress of Sugarcane Technologists, Barbados, BWI, Apr. 20–24, 1953. See also *J. Agr. Univ. P. R.* **38** (1) 22–37 1954.
10. Samuels, G., Lugo-López, M. A., and Landrau Jr., P., Factors affecting the sucrose content of sugarcane: Fertilizers, *J. Agr. Univ. P. R.* **36** (3) 194–202 1592.

RESEARCH NOTES[1]

PHOSPHORUS CONTENT OF PINEAPPLE JUICE

The phosphorus content of the pineapple juice prepared from the eradicator meat is higher than that of the juice prepared from the corresponding cylinders of the fruit. The determinations of phosphorus were made using the photometric method of Wolf[2]. The quantity of phosphorus present in 13 different juices prepared from the eradicator meat had an average of 15.9 mg./100 ml. The quantity found in the juices prepared from the cylinders of the same fruit had an average of 11.4 mg./100 ml. The results were analyzed statistically and showed a very significant difference.

Rafael Santini, Jr.

[1] Beginning with this issue of the Journal there will appear in this department, whenever available, brief accounts of research findings which, while of importance, would not sustain a formal article.

[2] Wolf, B., *Ind. Eng. Chem. Anal.* Ed. **16** (2) 121–23 1944.